

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-3, 5, and 10-11 have been amended and claims 13-21 are added. Support for claims 13 and 19 is found in Figs. 6A, 6B, and 8 and pages 15-18. Also, the title has been amended. The Amendment to the title responds to the objection. It is respectfully requested the objection to the title be withdrawn. No new matter has been added.

The amendment to claim 11 inserts a comma in the preamble and has no bearing on patentability of claim 11 as it has no effect on how claim 11 is interpreted. The amendment to claim 5 corrects informalities found therein. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the objection to claim 5 be withdrawn. Newly added claim 15 includes the features of allowable claim 4. No new matter has been added.

Applicant appreciates the allowance of claims 11 and 12 on page 6 of the Office Action. Applicant also appreciates the indication of allowability for claims 4 and 7-9 in paragraph 5, on page 5 of the Office Action. However, for the reasons discussed below, all of claims 1-21 are allowable.

In paragraph 4, on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5, 6 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Takahashi et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,454,390 B1 ("Takahashi"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Takahashi fails to disclose a best pattern printing instructing unit that causes the printing unit to print information indicating the selected best test pattern on the printing medium, as recited in claims 1 and 10.

In Takahashi, a confirmation pattern is printed in order that a user can confirm a success in the dot alignment (col. 41, lines 45-50). However, Takahashi prints three printing patterns and two of the three printing patterns are for adjusting while the third is a confirmation pattern, which confirms a success in the dot alignment (col. 41, lines 45-54). Although the confirmation

pattern is printed at the time the other two printing patterns are printed, Takahashi fails to disclose which pattern is the best. Instead, the user confirms with the ruler mark pattern that there has been an adjustment. In addition, the printed patterns are only test patterns that have been set automatically through a series of automatic dot alignment sequences controlled by an algorithm (col. 41, lines 59-67). A dot alignment processing uses the algorithm to provide an adjusting system at two stages of the course adjustment and the fine adjustment in the printing registration of the bi-directional printing (col. 41, lines 59-62). But, it is the user that confirms which pattern is the best pattern made by the adjustment using a confirmation pattern. Nowhere does Takahashi disclose that the adjusting system prints information indicating which pattern was selected as the best test pattern from the series of test patterns on the printing medium.

Applicant's ink jet printer, on the other hand, includes a best pattern printing instructing unit that causes the printing unit to print information indicating the selected best test pattern on the printing medium. As describe in the Background of the Application, although an optimum test pattern can be determined and set automatically by scanning those test patterns by the reading means, a problem remains that an inspector cannot recognize which is the optimum test pattern that has been set automatically, and cannot visually check whether the test pattern that has been determined to be the best test pattern is really the best one (lines 4-11; page 4).

Applicant addresses this problem; Takahashi's invention does not.

Thus, Takahashi does not literally disclose each and every feature of Applicant's claimed invention as recited in claims 1 and 10 and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 is inappropriate. Further, for the reasons discussed, Takahashi does not suggest the features as recited in claims 1 and 10.

Because Takahashi does not anticipate or suggest the recited features of claims 1 and 10, Takahashi cannot possibly anticipate or suggest the subject matter of claims 2-3 and 5-6, which

depend from claim 1, for the reasons discussed with respect to claim 1 and for the additional features recited therein. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-10 and 13-21, in addition to already allowed claims 11-12, are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Kurt P. Goudy
Registration No. 52,954

JAO:KPG/tea

Date: July 8, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--